

DAVE REICHERT, WASHINGTON
SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

TODD YOUNG, INDIANA
MIKE KELLY, PENNSYLVANIA
TIM GRIFFIN, ARKANSAS
JIM RENACCI, OHIO
TOM REED, NEW YORK
CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, Jr., LOUISIANA

LLOYD DOGGETT, TEXAS
SUBCOMMITTEE RANKING MEMBER
JOHN LEWIS, GEORGIA
JOSEPH CROWLEY, NEW YORK
DANNY K. DAVIS, ILLINOIS

DAVE CAMP, MICHIGAN, CHAIRMAN
SANDER M. LEVIN, MICHIGAN, RANKING MEMBER
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JENNIFER SAFAVIAN, STAFF DIRECTOR
MATT WEIDINGER, SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF DIRECTOR

JANICE MAYS, MINORITY CHIEF COUNSEL
NICHOLAS GWYN, SUBCOMMITTEE MINORITY STAFF

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

April 4, 2014

Rebecca Kilburn
Senior Economist
RAND Corporation
P.O. Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138

Dear Ms. Kilburn:

Thank you for testifying at our April 2, 2014 Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources hearing and for sharing your valuable expertise related to using evidence to evaluate programs. Because of time limitations, there were a few points you made during the hearing that we were unable to fully explore. I would like to ask you to provide the Subcommittee with additional information on these issues, and I have included an additional question below that I hope you will answer in writing by April 18, 2014. As I mentioned at the end of the hearing, we will include your answers in the official hearing record.

Thank you again for your participation in our hearing, and I look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Reichert", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Dave Reichert
Chairman

Ensuring MIECHV Program Models Are Implemented Effectively

In your written and oral testimony, you pointed out that it's important for programs like MIECHV to focus funding on interventions that have been proven to work, instead of specifying what types of features a program should have. In your written testimony you go even further, saying you believe "consideration should be given to whether ongoing funding to particular states should be tied more closely to the state's implementation performance."

Under the current program structure, states receive funding to use on models that are based on evidence and that have shown success in high-quality studies. However, it's not clear that we know how well states are implementing the models they choose to administer. How might we implement a suggestion like yours, where the federal government also analyzes the state's performance in implementing the model successfully? Are there other programs that do this that we could review?